

FRANK M. PECK,)	
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	Case No. 2:12-cv-00898-JCM-NJK
)	
vs.)	ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
)	PREJUDICE MOTION TO NOT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA,)	ENTER JUDGMENT
)	
Defendant(s).)	(Docket No. 28)

It appears that the crux of the dispute presently before the Court revolves around the enforceability of the settlement placed on the record by the parties. *See* Docket No. 26. Neither

² Plaintiff's motion seeking a ruling on his Rule 60(b) motion is hereby **DENIED** as moot. *See* Docket No. 32.

1 party provides any authority regarding the enforcement of a settlement agreement and the Court will
 2 not resolve such an issue without developed argument presented by the parties discussing relevant
 3 authority. *See, e.g., Vaccine Ctr. LLC v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 68298, at *8
 4 n.4 (D. Nev. May 14, 2013) (quoting *Williams v. Eastside Lumberyard & Supply Co.*, 190 F. Supp.
 5 2d 1104, 1114 (S.D. Ill. 2001)).³ The procedure to resolve this issue is: (1) Defendants file a motion
 6 seeking to enforce the settlement; (2) Plaintiff files a response opposing that motion; and (3)
 7 Defendants file a reply.

8 For the reasons discussed above, the Court rules as follows:

- 9 • Plaintiff's motion that judgment not be entered (Docket No. 28) is **DENIED** without
 10 prejudice.
- 11 • Plaintiff's motion seeking a ruling on the above motion (Docket No. 32) is **DENIED**
 12 as moot.
- 13 • The issue of the enforceability of the settlement agreement shall be raised to the
 14 Court as follows: (1) no later than August 5, 2013, Defendants shall file a motion to
 15 enforce the settlement supported by developed argument with citation to legal
 16 authority; (2) no later than August 26, 2013, Plaintiff shall file his response in
 17 opposition; and (3) no later than September 9, 2013, Defendants shall file a reply.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: July 19, 2013

20
 21 
 22 _____
 23 Nancy J. Koppe
 24 United States Magistrate Judge
 25

26 ³ This Court recently discussed some of the pertinent issues to such a motion. *See Pavon v.*
 27 *UPS*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 94205 (D. Nev. May 17, 2013), *adopted*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 94204 (D.
 28 Nev. July 5, 2013).